MEETING NOTES

Regional Plan 2012 – Working Group for Circulation & Bicycle Element
Thursday, February 9, 2012
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Flagstaff City Hall, Staff Conference Room

CAC Members:

1. Julie Leid
2. Nat White
3. Ben Anderson
4. Mike Nesbitt

Contributing Staff and General Public
1. Darrel Barker, Comprehensive Planning Project Manager
2. Bob Caravona, Advance Planning Manager
3. Kim Sharp, Neighborhood Planner
4. Dave Wessel, FMPO Manager
5. Martin Ince, Multi-modal Planner
6. Kate Morley, Coconino County Planner
7. Brian Foley, FMPO and City of Flagstaff Intern
8. Rick Miller, General Public and Conservation Study Forum

Meeting commences: 3:34 p.m.

Darrel Barker, Comprehensive Planning Project Manager leads meeting discussion.

1. **Packet #2:** Darrel Barker opens the meeting by explaining that Packet #2 has yet to be refined and that it will likely remain "as is" until the working group has finalized the goals and policies. Comments on the packet are listed in track changes along with additional notes on existing goals and policies. The glossary and list of acronyms will continue to evolve. The group responds that they are OK with this approach.

2. **Introduction, Goals and Policies:**
   a. Darrel Barker explains that two draft introductions have been provided and that staff is seeking comments and direction from the working group. Darrel asks if there is a preference or if the group would like to edit/merge the two. Nat White responds that he is happy with both and that we should not worry about word-smithing the introductions right now, but should move forward with refining the goals and policies based upon the

Tucson model that was provided. Julie Leid agrees, and further states that we should use the final goals and policies as a basis for re-evaluating the introduction.

b. Darrel introduces the proposed goals and policies that are based upon the Tucson circulation element content and structure as an alternative to reorganizing the existing goals and policies of the regional plan. There is general agreement among the working group that we should move forward with the new model. Kate Morley stated that we should compare the existing goals and policies with those that we are proposing from the Tucson model. Dave Wessel responds that we have already cross-checked the documents.

c. Rick Miller states that he likes the Tucson model, but would prefer that we replace the bicycle policies with those proposed by the Flagstaff Bicycle Advisory Committee. Darrel stated that we should also include language referring to the FUTS system.

d. Kate stated that "safety" needs its own heading with a safety goal and policies, which could include such things as bike boxes, signage, turn-outs, etc. Dave responded that these specific items would be covered in strategies, but that we could develop new safety policies. Dave then referred to things mentioned in the existing regional plan that are not sufficiently covered in the Tucson model, such as priorities. Dave further stated that priorities could be addressed under the "public support" heading, and gave as an example a policy which would "seek public support on decision making".

e. Nat stated that he got the implication that safety was implied in many of the policies already, but that it was not specifically addressed in the element. Ben Anderson stated that safety should be retained as a discrete goal, as it is a big concern throughout the community. Julie commented that education should be a component of the safety goals and policies, and referred to the five "E's". Martin Ince then explained that the five "E's" refer to: Engineering, Enforcement, Evaluation, Encouragement and Eucation. Dave commented that these could be included as policies under safety. Nat stated that there are many policies that could be included under safety, including those specific to pedestrian, bicycle, etc.

f. Martin commented that when encouraging pedestrian and bicycle safety, it is often "comfort" level which determines where people will ride or walk. Martin then referred to Butler Avenue as an example, in that the bike lanes are considered "safe", but people do not feel "comfortable" using them due to the high volumes of traffic. Kate asked if there is something that would make people feel safer or more comfortable. Dave stated that design factors could be calibrated to the community, and that streets could be assessed in an effort to determine ways to increase the comfort level. Julie commented that we also need to have multiple choices in travel modes.

g. Dave stated that another issue that needs to be sufficiently addressed in the goals and polices is "connectivity". Dave further stated that connectivity is also a context issue and needs to be considered as a part of development patterns. Dave commented that connectivity is probably well enough addressed at the policy level. Dave also stated that he didn't care for some of the language of the Tucson model, such as the use of "promote" and "design" in policy statements. Nat stated that connectivity could be included under Policy T1.1 of the Tucson model.

h. Kate inquired about Policy T1.7 (which references travel demand strategies and incentives) of the Tucson model, and what some examples might include. Dave provided

an example of "Eco-passes" for the bus system and other employer incentives. Kate stated that these could be included as strategies.

i. Nat referred to Policy T1.8, in that it begins to talk about priorities for circulation investments. Dave said that staff would develop a "priority" statement to more specifically address priority investments, and that we would need to be careful as priorities often change. Nat stated that priorities need to include reference to both engineering and public support. Dave stated that a priority policy should be included under public support, and that an explicit process should be referenced there. Dave then stated that we definitely want to pursue a priority statement.

j. Dave asked if the references to rail are strong enough in the Tucson model. Dave also stated that the "economic" aspect of the element is woven throughout the document and asked if we needed to more specifically address this. Erika Mazza stated that it all goes back to priorities and recognizing how important transportation is to economic development. Nat stated that rail is very important to Flagstaff, where it might be of lesser importance in Tucson.

k. Dave asked if we need to develop a goal segment that is specific to rail and aviation. Bob Caravona stated that aviation is not covered anywhere in the existing regional plan. Kate proposed that we could include another segment called "Other Modes", under which rail and aviation could be addressed. Rick asked if we needed to somehow integrate all modes within the element. Dave responded that the idea of integration is mentioned many times throughout the document and gave examples of policies T1.1 and T1.5. Dave then asked if we should reference the "efficiency" of modal options. Nat stated that we still have a lot of room to elaborate in strategies.

l. Dave asked if we need to look at the role of strategies in the regional plan. Bob stated that strategies will likely be placed in an appendix of the regional plan as a reference for program managers. Bob also commented that by placing them in an appendix they could much more easily be amended, if necessary. Dave stated that one concern is that in the existing regional plan you need to read the strategies to understand the intent of the goals and policies. Dave also inquired as to whether there would be any legal implications associated with the strategies.

m. Dave asked about the need to include references to land use in relation to circulation. Erika commented that we should keep such references broad, and ensure that everything is linked/integral. Kate stated that such relationships are referenced in the introduction and text of Packet #2. Dave commented that there is some value in having land use and transportation point to each other. Dave further stated that we could expand on context sensitive solutions for transportation as related to land use. Nat stated that a policy could be included under T1 that recognizes land uses broadly as "Rural, Urban, Activity Centers, etc". Dave stated that this is how land uses are categorized in the regional transportation plan, and that this could be carried over into the regional plan.

n. Kate referred to policy T6.4, and asked whether this applied to Flagstaff because it seemed to imply the use of light rail. Erika stated that for Flagstaff it would apply as rapid bus transit, and that it does fit into our element.

o. Ben asked if we should consider creating a goal specific to rail and air. Ben further asked if we should include mentions of equestrian and off-road in the element. Martin stated

that equestrian and off-road options are addressed in the open space element. Kate stated that we need to address trails and the FUTS system.

p. Dave asked whether we need to bifurcate the circulation element into recreation versus transportation, as this could have consequences related to the funding of projects (an example was given in which certain applications for funding may relate specifically to "transportation" projects and not to "recreation" projects). Nat commented that we should change the title of the "Circulation and Bicycle" element to "Transportation". Kate commented that state statute requires a "bicycle" element, but wasn't sure if we actually need to include it in the title as long as it is addressed in the regional plan. Kate stated that we might want to include everything we can think of related to transportation modes to avoid potential funding problems in the future. Julie stated that we should be careful, and that she would be hesitant to lump "trails" into "transportation". Nat commented that the trails system serves two purposes: transportation and recreation. Martin stated that we should embrace the dual nature of the system, and questioned drawing any distinction between the two. Martin further commented that we should play it both ways and address it in the element as to cover both. Nat asked again about the title of the element. Bob said that we could take the title to the CAC and see if they are interested in changing it to "Transportation".

q. Darrel asked if there were any other items that the working group would like to comment on. Kate stated that we need to include language concerning equestrian uses in Doney Park, as discussed at the previous meeting. Nat stated that we need to include references to infrastructure under "Auto and Truck Facilities". Dave asked if the working group preferred to use the term "facilities" or "infrastructure" throughout the element. The group preferred that we use "infrastructure". Nat stated that under "Environment" we need to address noise, plants and animals; and under "Auto and Truck" we need to talk about technology, giving the example of computer-controlled traffic lights. Dave commented that he would like to talk about the content of Packet #2 at the next meeting if we complete the goals and policies.

3. **Meeting Conclusion**

a. Darrel stated that prior to the next meeting the working group would receive a revised version of the goals and policies to reflect working group comments and meeting discussion, and that it would follow the proposed Tucson model. It was further stated that Packet #2 would remain unchanged until the goals and policies were finalized by the working group.

Meeting adjourns at 5:00 p.m.